

BSEP PLANNING & OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE MINUTES

January 28, 2014

BUSD Offices –Technology Room 126
2020 Bonar Street, Berkeley, CA 94702

P&O Committee Members Present:

Mike Wetzel, <i>Cragmont (Sub)</i>	Elisabeth Hensley, <i>King (co-Chair)</i>
Boyd Power, <i>Emerson</i>	Bruce Simon, <i>King</i>
Shauna Rabinowitz, <i>Jefferson</i>	Dawn Paxson, <i>Emerson/Willard</i>
Danielle Perez, <i>John Muir</i>	Margaret Phillips, <i>Willard</i>
Chris Martin, <i>LeConte (co-Chair)</i>	Aaron Glimme, <i>Berkeley High</i>
Catherine Huchting, <i>Malcolm X</i>	Larry Gordon, <i>Berkeley High</i>
Lea Baechler-Brabo, <i>Oxford</i>	John Lavine, <i>Berkeley High</i>
Juliet Bashore, <i>Rosa Parks (co-Rep)</i>	Catherine Lazio, <i>Berkeley High</i>
Keira Armstrong, <i>Washington</i>	Ramal Lamar, <i>B-Tech</i>
	Louise Harm, <i>Independent Study</i>

P&O Committee Members Absent:

Moshe Cohen, <i>Pre-K</i>	Radha Seshagiri, <i>Thousand Oaks (Alt)</i>
Lily Howell, <i>Pre-K (Alt)</i>	Kim Sanders, <i>Longfellow</i>
Sergio Duran, <i>Arts Magnet</i>	Ellen Weis, <i>Longfellow</i>
Tim Frederick, <i>Cragmont</i>	Austin Lloyd, <i>BHS (Alt)</i>
Darryl Bartlow, <i>John Muir (Alt)</i>	Orlando Williams, <i>BHS (Alt)</i>
Yusef Auletta, <i>LeConte (Alt)</i>	
Dan Smuts, <i>Rosa Parks (co-Rep)</i>	
Patrick Hamill, <i>Thousand Oaks</i>	

Visitors, School Board Directors, Union Reps, and Guests:

Richard Boyden, *BHS Athletic Fund*
Mark Coplan, *BUSD Public Information Officer*
Donald Evans, *BUSD Superintendent*
Jay Nitschke, *Director of Technology*
Julie Sinai, *Board Member*

BSEP Staff:

Natasha Beery, *BSEP Director*
Valerie Tay, *BSEP Program Specialist*
Linda Race, *BSEP Staff Support*

1. Call to Order, Introductions & Site Reports

At 7:15 p.m. Co-chair Chris Martin called the meeting to order by welcoming attendees, and by asking P&O members to give a brief update on School Governance Council activity at their sites.

2. Establish the Quorum

The quorum was approved with 16 voting members initially present. 13 voting members are required for a quorum.

3. Chairperson's Comments

Chris Martin and Elisabeth Hensley

No comments were given at this meeting.

4. BSEP Director's Comments

Natasha Beery, BSEP Director

Beery provided the following handout: *BSEP Measure Planning Draft Timeline, Updated 1.21.14, Donald Evans, Natasha Beery, Josh Daniels, Julie Sinai*

Beery stated that the Board pulled the BSEP Annual Report for 2012-13 and First Interim for 2013-14 for discussion from the January 15, 2014 Board meeting and rescheduled it for discussion on February 12, 2013. Beery believes that there were some concerns, especially for the sustainability of the VAPA budget, which the P&O Committee has discussed. The Music/VAPA Director, Suzanne McCulloch will be away the week of February 12, but the Board will be hearing a presentation focused on VAPA funding for March 26. Beery noted that pulling the Report for discussion is a good thing; it means the Board is interested in discussing the trajectory of the BSEP funds.

Beery shared with the committee that she and Charity DaMarto, Director OFEE, attended an event called *Budget Games: Innovations for Civic Engagement*, hosted at Adobe in San Jose, January 17, 2013. While she did not feel the online format would work for district use, there were some aspects of the event she thought would be useful: getting people to see things from the perspective of different stakeholders, and weighing the trade-offs between budget priorities. Beery discussed with Neil Smith, Superintendent for Educational Services, the possibility of using the technique for the first meeting of the Parent Advisory Council on LCAP.

Beery has been working with Debbie D'Angelo, Director of Evaluation and Assessment, to create a district-wide survey that sites can use or customize. According to Beery, gathering information to feed into site plans will be challenging given the uncertainties around budgeting due to the LCAP this year. Beery and D'Angelo will attend the Principal's meeting 1-29-14 and share with them a core survey that contains seven questions that the Board directed sites to ask in order to assess school climate and student and parent engagement district-wide. These questions will be used to assess the Parent Outreach/Liaison pilot. The assessment will compare before and after information between sites, some of which have parent engagement/liaison programs and some that do not. Last year, the questions were included in the SGC surveys but were adapted, moved and in some cases, duplicated.

This year, some of the schools would like to provide alternatives to surveys, such as community forums and focus groups. A basic survey will be offered to sites that want to use it, or they can carefully incorporate the core questions into their own survey. There needs to be a balance between getting district-wide information while providing autonomy to the sites, gathering data that is useful while not overwhelming parents with something that is too long to complete. Next year the plan is to have an SGC training workshop on surveys - creating a good survey and how to look at data. Schools have used their surveys to ask specific questions about programs they are contemplating funding through discretionary funds, PTA funds or BSEP funds, and it's important to have well-constructed questions.

Beery noted that we will probably not know soon enough what the district will fund or what BSEP will fund in order to tailor surveys in that direction. Beery stated that this will be an evolving process and a complex year as the district interprets the new state funding regulations, looks at the district-wide budget, and works with the sites and all of the committees that are a part of the LCAP process, so that sites can finally make their decisions. All of those decisions will be made over the next few months.

Beery presented the *BSEP Measure Planning Draft Timeline, Updated 1.21.14*. The Superintendent called a preliminary planning meeting with Beery, Josh Daniels, Julie Sinai, and they made a few changes to the calendar. P&O Co-chairs Chris Martin and Elisabeth Hensley will be included in a follow-up meeting in February to begin putting together a P&O subcommittee or a steering group that will help shepherd this process forward. Sooner or later, there will be discussions as to whether and when to engage a consultant and survey community and stakeholders. In the past, there was a city-wide survey done before the measure launched, and there is some interest in doing an internal district-wide survey as an earlier step.

Beery thanked Follansbee and Cleveland for coming to the P&O Meeting. Pauline Follansbee, Director of Fiscal Services, has come in past years to present the “Teacher Template” in relation to the planning the budget. In conjunction with Director Follansbee’s presentation, Deputy Superintendent Javetta Cleveland was attending to provide a brief overview of Class Size Reduction in conjunction with LCAP. On February 11, 2014, Cleveland will return to do a more complete overview of all of the elements of LCAP. The point of tonight’s presentations is to provide the P&O Committee with an understanding of the CSR budget, which is 2/3 of the BSEP monies, from the perspectives of the “Teacher Template” for planning and what that represents in the context of BSEP and LCAP.

Co-chair Martin requested that the original agenda items 5, 6, and 7 be moved to the end of the meeting, so that Follansbee and Cleveland could make their presentations (agenda items 8, and 9) earlier in the meeting.

5. BSEP Class Size Funds and “Teacher Template” Presentation

Pauline Follansbee, Director of Fiscal Services

Follansbee provided the following handout: *BSEP Teacher Template “Cheat Sheet” v.2014-01-28*.

Follansbee stated that the Teacher Template is a tool that is used to determine teacher staffing in the classrooms. The first page, “Part 1 of the Teacher Template,” presented the background for the Teacher Template. The Teacher Template is a budgeting tool which uses grade level and school enrollment to calculate teacher staffing levels. The matrix shown on the first page shows the formulas used to determine Class Size by the General Fund share, the Measure A (BSEP) share and Teacher Release Time as needed. Once the BSEP contribution to FTE is determined, it is multiplied by the average teacher compensation to come up with the amount transferred from BSEP to the General Fund every year. Follansbee stated that it is actually more complicated when putting into practice.

Next, Follansbee walked the committee through how classroom staffing works: “Example and Walk Through of Part 1.” The first of three pages presents “Staffing Enrollment by Grade.” For Kindergarten, the General Fund provides for Teacher FTE at a ratio of 34:1, which equals 22.76 FTE. In order to bring class sizes down to 20:1, BSEP Measure A provides for 15.94 FTE, and to that is added “Necessary FTE” (a rounding mechanism that is an additional amount to insure a round number) of 0.30 FTE. The same thing is done for Grade 1, and the only difference is that is where Release Time comes into

play. So for the Grade 1 FTE, the General Fund picks up 21.47 FTE, and Measure A picks up 15.03 FTE. For the Release Time FTE for Grade 1, the General Fund picks up 0.86 FTE and Measure A picks up 0.60 FTE. In addition, there is an adjustment for Grades 1-3 for Necessary FTE of 2.60. For the K-5 Totals, the General Fund picks up 132.86 FTE and Measure A picks up a total of 77.92 FTE (74.17 + 3.75 Necessary FTE). This exercise is continued for the Special Day Class as well. Their ratios are different but tied to the original ratio.

Middle school FTE numbers start at the bottom of the first page and continues on to the second page. For Grades 6-8, the General Fund picks up 62.47 FTE in the first column and Measure A picks up the next two columns for a total of 18.35 FTE.

The total for Grades 9-12 are shown as well. District-wide, based on projected enrollment of 9,070 for 2013-14, the General Fund Picks up 296.50 FTE and Measure A picks up a total of 131.53 FTE. These numbers do not include Pre-school. The FTE does include Transitional Kindergarten. Independent Study is included as part of the High School numbers.

Follansbee presented the third and last page of this section, "BSEP/Measure A Projected Expense for CSR." For the FTE Average Compensation, the FTE from the previous page is multiplied by the average compensation. BSEP also contributes to some of the Average Substitute Costs and Direct Support. The total BSEP transfer is \$11,925,900. **The summary is shown below with the total FTE of 131.53 and 2012-14 Budget of \$11,925,900.**

Follansbee presented "Part 2 Discretionary Staffing" for 2013-14. Discretionary Staffing includes staffing for Expanded Course Offerings at BHS and the Middle Schools, Middle School Counseling Services and Program Support (shown on the first and second pages). **The Total Discretionary staffing is 34.3 FTE and a total cost of \$3,063,560. The total projected BSEP/Measure A expense for 2013-14 for 165.83 FTE is \$14,989,460.** Because calculations of FTE are made for the following year, these estimates are revised at First Interim when there are actuals.

In response to a question about the General Fund picking up a portion of the ULSS/RtI², Follansbee stated that will be an ongoing discussion every year. Beery reminded the committee that the Measure says that the funds go to Class Size Reduction first; after that, the funds will go to Expanded Course Offerings, Middle School Counselors and Program Support. These additional expenses are not done by a formula in the same way as CSR FTE. Last year, retroactively, the General Fund picked up a portion of the RtI². It is not anticipated that the General Fund will pick that up this year. Cleveland clarified that last year, when the books were closed, the district had to meet a Maintenance of Effort (MOE) requirement for Special Education to show that the same amount was expended in the current year as in the previous year. The district made the decision to move some costs that would qualify as Special Education costs back into the budget as a one-time transfer. Cleveland is not sure there would be the same level of savings this year, depending on a number of factors. Baechler-Brabo added that the 5.5 FTE for both the K-5 and 6-8 was added during budgetary crunch times and at that time, there was some discussion as to whether it was one-time or ongoing aid. Cleveland recalled that it was also a programmatic issue around BSEP providing more support for students of need. Martin asked for a further explanation of the funding. Cleveland stated that at one time, RTI² was not a part of BSEP, so it was not an issue. Cleveland said that when she arrived in the district, Special Ed costs were going up \$800,000/year. The district brought in someone who was very instrumental in balancing the budget. Last year was the first year that the Special Ed budget came in under budget. Many factors are involved in the costs for Special Education.

When asked, Cleveland confirmed that B-Tech funds are calculated separately in the teacher transfer and that B-Tech does receive its share of Class Size monies. Follansbee confirmed that the General Fund pays for teachers under “Page 1” and then BSEP transfers monies into the GF and “Page 2” is paid directly from BSEP. Beery confirmed that BSEP also allows for B-Tech and Independent Study to receive allocations for 150 students even though they may not have that number of students, based on the understanding they have different needs. Glimme stated that while the high school receives funding for 28:1, B-Tech receives funding for 18:1 staffing ratio. Follansbee and Cleveland added that Special Ed at B-Tech is staffed through Special Ed as needed, and staffed at a higher level than enrollment. Cleveland stated that if there were no State CSR funding or BSEP support, the class size ratio would be 50:1 with the current level of district funding. Beery said that BSEP funding has qualified BUSD for state CSR funding that the district may not receive at previous levels because of the LCFF changes which will now reward 24:1 rather than 20:1 for K-3. Paxson asked if TWI funding follows the kids, but Martin clarified that the other schools might need the support for more years, at least 3-5 years. Nitschke mentioned that the state budget rolls class size reduction into the base grant. Beery brought up that the calculation of release time for K-6 is in the teacher contract and that may be discussed as the VAPA issues move forward. Beery also clarified that each of the BSEP budgets includes indirect costs (overhead costs) that gets paid directly to the district.

6. BSEP and State Funds Class Sized Reduction Issues Presentation

Javetta Cleveland, Deputy Superintendent

Cleveland provided the following handouts: *Local Control Funding Formula and the Local Accountability Plan LCAP–2012-13* (PowerPoint Presentation Slide hardcopy) and *LCFF Funding Increase Over 8 Years Bar Graph*

Cleveland repeated that she wanted to focus on the funding side of the LCAP, and she would return on February 11, 2013 to discuss more of the academic side of the formula, how the district is approaching LCAP and to get more input from the P&O Committee on LCAP. Cleveland presented a 12-slide PowerPoint on LCAP and provided a 7-page hard copy. The new funding formula increases transparency as to how school districts spend their money and provides a mechanism for engagement with stakeholders. It places less restrictions on the funding and holds districts locally accountable for how the funding is expended towards supporting targeted student groups: Low Income Students (Free & Reduced Lunch), English Learners, Foster Youth as well as Students with Disabilities and certain Racial and Ethnic Groups. The State money will be funded in base and supplemental funding. This does not impact any Federal funding. The additional funding will be provided to the District over an 8-year period to get the district back to 2007-08 levels by year 2020-21, with a Cost of Living Adjustment. Cleveland elaborated on slide 4 “LCFF – Increase of \$15.9M by 2020-21 to get us back to 2007-2008 funding” that showed the entire gap at \$15.9 M. It will not be known how much will be given each year; it will depend on the passage of the state budget each year. The new formula, “LCFF Target,” shows the district will continue to get \$5.2M for home to school transportation. It also shows that CSR will be sharing \$2.6M with CTE (Career Technical Education funding that did not exist in the old model) and will be rolled into the base grant. (Cleveland showed it on the graph separated out for clarification.) The supplemental grant funding will be \$5.9M for the targeted populations in BUSD. Cleveland noted that the new formula requires an LCAP, which she will talk about at the next P&O meeting.

Slide 5—"LCAP" outlined what must be included in the LCAP. The budget will be tied to the annual goals and indicators through a district-wide plan.

Slide 8—"LCFF 2020-21 Entitlement Calculation" shows how much the district will receive based on target populations per student. The 42% Supplemental (of the 20%) shows the amount of funding per student.

The state is requiring a ratio of 24:1 for class size ratios for funding at each school site, not a district-wide average. Berkeley's funding will be reduced to \$1.9M. The Class Size Average is required but is not a concern for BUSD because the district is currently maintaining 20:1. The difference of \$700,000 for the current school year was funded through base grant funding. In the future, there will be a discussion of what the district will support in class size.

Beery clarified that there are multiple intersecting issues: logistical issues, interpretation of the Measure issues, trade-off issues, and decisions around base and supplemental funding. Beery quoted from the Measure: (Section 3.A.ii) "Average class sizes in the K-3 grades shall be reduced to 20:1 as long as state class size reduction funds are provided for that purpose at a level not less than currently funded by the State." This group may have a debate about whether or not BSEP could step into provide additional funding due to the state providing \$2.6M rather than \$1.9M in CSR funds. If the BSEP fund does so, this would take away funding that would otherwise be available for discretionary funds such as Expanded Course Offerings and Program Support, also called "CSR Page 2." Meanwhile, there are decisions being made at the district level about BSEP "Page 2" funding, as to whether some might be funded by the district as base and supplemental. There are issues around "supplemental" and "supplanting." In addition, there are the logistics around 20:1 and 24:1 and Beery mentioned the impacts this might have on the numbers of teachers and use of facilities. Beery turned to Jay Nitschke to address the logistics around class size numbers, and he responded that hypothetically, if the district went to 24:1 next fall (which is not being planned), it would only be in K that that would happen. If you assume the same (enrollment) numbers as this year, you would only save \$.5M and open up 6 classrooms. You would only be doing it for one grade level one year and then two grade levels the next year and so forth. And while you save \$.5M a year the first 4 years, years 5 and 6, you will be buying down those classes.

Superintendent Evans added that these complicated issues are being reviewed at the district level, hopefully it will come together and there will be suggestions for the Board. The thought is to look at how these things will impact not only BSEP, but also LCAP, and how they will intersect.

Paxson brought up that past parents' concerns were around the 20:1 ratio for K-3. That was one of the many pieces of why it came to the voters, and she felt that it was interesting and fortunate that as the Measure "sunsets", the district will be looking at the class size ratio. Beery added that the demographic study would be shared at the next Board meeting with a forecast of continued growth in the district at a similar rate. For the next few years, the district may grow at a rate of 150-200 students per year.

Lazio asked about supplemental funding for targeted students: was there an opportunity for sites that may be paying for programs that support the targeted students to have those costs picked up by the district? Cleveland stated that the district is supposed to increase or improve those services and demonstrate that in the LCAP, and that is an issue for some parents who think that things will not change. Martin stated that the same group (of parents) would feel very strongly that BSEP has picked up funding for things that the General Fund should be funding going forward.

The template for how to use the funds focuses more on student outcomes. Sites often dedicate site funds to targeted students, but funds also come from PTA. Lamar stated that the parents and students at B-Tech want to know how the district determine the allocation of LCFF funds and how much will B-Tech get? Cleveland stated that the LCAP is not necessarily structured for allocating money to specific schools and referred to slide 10 which shows how stakeholders will be engaged in expressing their interest in how the funds are used. The funds are allocated district-wide, and B-Tech has those targeted students and the LCAP will be supportive of B-Tech. Lamar stated that there was a high concentration of targeted students at B-Tech. Beery stated that LCAP has to have measures and outcomes for the targeted students, so funds allocated to B-Tech would need to demonstrate by the way the funds and services are allocated that there is a focus on improved outcomes for specific target groups.

The dates for the public LCAP meetings are noted in the master calendar and on the district's website calendar. The LCAP summary timeline is the last slide of the presentation.

7. Approval of Minutes: January 14, 2014

MOTION CARRIED (Lamar/Glimme): To approve the meeting minutes of the January 14, 2014 P&O Committee Meeting.

The motion was approved with a showing of 10 hands, with no objections, and 6 abstentions.

8. Public Comment

Keira Armstrong noted that the Garden meeting was positive but that it was pulled from the Board meeting agenda.

9. Subcommittee Report: Parent Outreach & Public Information

Natasha Beery, BSEP Director

Beery provided the following handout: *Public Information and Parent Outreach Goals.*

Beery announced that this coming Thursday, January 30, 2014, there would be a joint meeting of the Technology and Library Subcommittees in the BSUD District Offices in Room 126.

Last Thursday, January 23, 2014, there was a joint meeting of the Parent Outreach and Public Information Subcommittees. It was well-attended and included some members of the P&O Committee and the public. Beery referred to her handout, stating that she shared the goals of Public Information and Parent Outreach in relation to BSEP, BUSD, and LCAP on page 1. Parent Engagement is one of the key state priorities in the LCAP and one that the district is already addressing, primarily through BSEP. This is a place where supplemental funding could arrive, because if the supplemental funding is targeted for families that are underserved or less engaged, then there might be a model that we've begun with BSEP that could be expanded through supplemental funding. Beery stated that the group discussed how to provide sites with more supports as listed in "Activities, Programs and Services."

Communications and Parent Outreach shared a lot of themes as shown in the handout. Beery noted that Charity DaMarto, Supervisor OFEE, will be reporting to the Board on February 12, 2014 on the Family Engagement and Equity pilot program. She will also discuss potential models for Parent Outreach continuation or expansion. Beery will be at the same Board meeting to deliver the BSEP Annual Report and information on BSEP funds in general.

Beery asked for feedback from the P&O Committee regarding Public Information and Parent Outreach. Paxson empathized with parents who need translation for things like IEPs and especially for parent teacher meetings. Beery confirmed that her office was receiving calls for this type of support to parents and school sites. Two of the languages often asked for are Spanish and Arabic.

Bashore wondered if the *A+ News* could be a place for public comment. There was a brief discussion about internet forums for public comment. Hensley agreed that the conversation should not be one way and there should be an effort around 2-way communication with the public, but that it should be moderated. Huchting mentioned that it could be monthly or weekly meetings in the schools (like the mayoral primary) and that the public could talk for 3-5 minutes. It would be good to record or keep a record of it so that we could track the bulk of the responses on various subjects within BSEP. She felt it's important to hear from the public on a regular basis. Beery stated that a community forum was used in December to launch the LCAP process, and it was very well-attended with over 60 people in attendance. The community was asked to submit their thoughts and ideas about the eight State Priorities to help students. The information was gathered and posted on the website. Beery tries to keep BSEP and the next measure in mind as the conversation around LCAP continues.

In response to a question from Wetzel regarding parent liaisons, Beery stated that the BSEP subcommittees are intended to inform the development of the BSEP annual plan and at the same time, the BSEP planning process takes place in a conversation with the staff and the Board about what might be possible. The piece about the parent liaisons budget doesn't go to the board until May (along with all of the rest of the budgets). Meanwhile, the site plans are being developed, and there needs to be a very close dialogue between the principals, district, Board, P&O, and SGCs, so that while intersecting decisions are being made, such as the parent liaison decision, the information gets to the sites in a timely way. The best guess she has is that the SGCs will have to come up with a priority list for their discretionary funding decisions. Martin stated that he felt that it would be a multi-year process to get the process to the right place and feel comfortable with it.

Beery outlined the interlocking decisions about budgets and LCAP:

- March—the CSR will have to be discussed to determine teacher numbers for HR
- April—Library, Music/VAPA will require lengthy discussions at the same time the LCAP draft is due
- May—development and revisions to other budgets, LCAP draft
- June—all the BSEP budgets and LCAP goes to the Board, public forum.

Lamar noted that “PCAD support at every site” was listed in Parent Outreach. Beery confirmed that was something that Charity DaMartto was planning as well as providing ELAC support at every site. Beery will put Lamar in touch with DaMartto so that he can send suggestions.

10. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by acclamation at 9:20 p.m.